

**MINUTES OF THE VINEYARD  
REDEVELOPMENT AGENCY BOARD MEETING  
Vineyard Town hall, 240 East Gammon Road, Vineyard, Utah  
January 13, 2016, 10:00 PM**

**PRESENT:**

Chairman Randy Farnworth  
Board member Tyce Flake  
Board member Julie Fullmer  
Board member Dale Goodman  
Board member Nate Riley

**ABSENT:**

**Staff Present:** Finance Director Jacob McHargue, Town Clerk/Recorder Pamela Spencer

**Others Attending:** Stewart Park - Anderson Geneva

The Vineyard Town Redevelopment Agency (RDA) held a board meeting on January 13, 2016 starting at 10:00 PM in the Vineyard Town hall.

---

**Regular Session** - The meeting was called to order at 10:00 PM.

**CONSENT ITEMS**

a) December 9, 2015 Minutes

**Motion:** BOARD MEMBER FULLMER MOVED TO APPROVE THE MINUTES FROM DECEMBER 9, 2015 AS WRITTEN. BOARD MEMBER GOODMAN SECONDED THE MOTION. ALL WERE IN FAVOR. THE MOTION CARRIED UNANIMOUSLY.

**BUSINESS ITEMS**

**2.1 *Discussion and Action – Concrete Crushing and Transite Removal Funds***

*Anderson Geneva is requesting to combine the concrete crushing revolving fund and the transite removal fund provided to them for removal of concrete and transite on the Geneva site. The Board will take appropriate action.*

Chairman Farnworth reviewed the request and turned the time over to Finance Director Jacob McHargue. Mr. McHargue explained that according to the ledger, Anderson Geneva used some of the money from the concrete crushing operation to do transite removal. He explained that a \$300,000 revolving fund was approved in November 2013 for concrete crushing and that a \$150,000 reimbursement fund was approved for transite removal. Mr. McHargue said Mr. Park recently requested that Vineyard combine the two funds. He mentioned that one check had already been issued for \$144,000 for concrete crushing and transite removal.

Mr. Park mentioned that they came to the council in November 2013 with their best estimate on what the concrete crushing operation and transite removal cost would be. He

said they had since uncovered more transite and estimated the cost for removal to be \$75,000 - \$90,000. Mr. Park talked about the process to remove the transite and how it correlated with removing the concrete. He talked about the expenses already incurred. He requested a total distribution of the remaining balance of \$306,000 to Anderson Geneva for the purpose of dealing with the immediate transite issue and to continue to use it for the two operations going forward.

Chairman Farnworth voiced concern with the concrete crushing operation. He remembered Anderson Geneva promising that concrete would not be brought in from off-site. He was concerned that RDA money was being spent to crush concrete from other projects. Other board members agreed that they remembered Gerald Anderson saying that concrete would not be brought in from other projects.

Mr. Park said he did not remember saying that no off-site concrete would be brought in. He explained that Anderson Geneva had learned more about the concrete crushing operation. He said crushers had a revenue stream because of a dumping fee and selling product to the public. He said the concrete crushing operation might run out of source material by April. He said they had been bringing in other concrete in order to get the gradation that was needed. He said he also learned that there was huge mobilization costs. He said it did not make sense to make the operation relocate until more concrete was dug up. He said the contract was limited to about 3 years. He said Anderson Geneva had no desire to set up a permanent concrete crushing operation.

Chairman Farnworth said the contract stated that they would not crush concrete from off the Geneva site. He said it was never meant to be a long-term operation. He said it was only meant for the RDA money to clean up Geneva concrete.

Mr. Park said the RDA money had only been used to purchase a set of scales, installation of the scales, and a mobile office unit, all of which the RDA now owned. He said he reviewed the minutes of past RDA meetings and did not see anything about limiting the concrete to only what came from the Geneva property. He talked more about the business sense of keeping the concrete crushing operation in its current location.

Board member Riley talked about Anderson Geneva's responsibility of cleaning up the concrete. He wondered why the concrete crushing operation would run out of material in the spring when there was still a lot of concrete on the property, especially around 800 North.

Mr. Park explained that there was a cost associated with bringing in equipment and pulling up concrete. He talked about possible costs associated with removing concrete plus a disposal fee.

Board member Riley said 1/3 of the RDA budget was set up for remediation. He said there should be shared revenue from the disposal fees.

Mr. Park talked about the set-up of a revolving fund. Anderson Geneva thought the project would self sustain, but they needed upfront costs to bring in the scales and the office, and to help with the initial pile of concrete. He said there now needed to be some kind of disposal fee.

The RDA Board voiced concern that Mr. Dunn was using the scales that were set up by the RDA to operate his business for material that was not from the RDA. They talked of the concern regarding his unfair advantage in the market place. Mr. Park disagreed and discussion ensued about the market and business of the concrete crushing operation. The RDA Board felt that they were subsidizing some of the costs of Mr. Dunn's concrete crushing operation.

Mr. Park said it was not the intent to make the operation a subsidized deal. He said it still did not make sense to make him move off the Geneva site.

Board member Riley firmly thought the two funds needed to stay separate and all requests for funds would be handled separately. He said the funds would reimburse what needed to be done rather than provide a check to cover future costs. He thought it was important for the RDA Board to maintain control of the balance of the money.

Boardmember Goodman talked about the need to dig down a minimum of 4 feet in order to put in a parking lot. He suggested that all concrete down to 4 feet could be pulled out now in order to keep the concrete crushing operation going. He thought the rest of the concrete could be taken out when they knew what the use would be.

Mr. Park explained that the property owned by UVU was sold at a discount and that UVU was responsible for removing concrete. He talked about costs for site-wide concrete cleaning up.

The RDA Board talked about the RDA money allocation - 1/3 for environmental remediation, 1/3 for infrastructure, and 1/3 for incentives. Board member Riley stressed that the RDA money for the environmental remediation would not equal 100% of the cost. He said that Anderson Geneva, as the landowner, had the primary responsibility to clean up the property and that the RDA could assist to bring it to a better level. He said it was never intended for 1/3 of the RDA money to be spent on 100% of the clean up. They talked about US Steel's shared responsibility to help with remediation. It was stressed that the clean up was a shared responsibility and not 100% from the RDA.

Discussion ensued regarding Mr. Dunn's operation and what the RDA money had been used for.

Board member Flake acknowledged that it was a complex operation. He explained that the board expected to hear honestly about what was going on, but did not believe it was happening. He agreed with keeping the funds separate because of past experience.

Board member Goodman thought that the only thing the RDA should be paying for now was the transite removal.

Mr. Park explained that they had not charged a disposal fee. He said he understood there were huge costs associated with breaking down heavily reinforced concrete. He explained that a crusher would have charged money to dispose of the concrete, but no money was paid. He said there was a cost associated with crushing the concrete to the right spec. Mr.

Park thought Mr. Dunn might ask for an offset for the amount of concrete he had already crushed.

The Board agreed that the transit removal funds and funds for concrete crushing should be kept separate and that money could be reimbursed for transite removal.

Board member Riley suggested that the new board address the remediation costs and decide if they were going to be responsible for 100% of the transite removal. He thought the board needed to decide what the RDA would cover and what the landowner would be responsible for.

### **ADJOURNMENT**

**Motion:** BOARD MEMBER GOODMAN MOVED TO ADJOURN THE MEETING AT 10:51 PM. CHAIRMAN FARNWORTH SECONDED THE MOTION. ALL WERE IN FAVOR. THE MOTION CARRIED.

The Redevelopment Agency Board will schedule future meetings as necessary.

MINUTES APPROVED ON \_\_\_\_\_

CERTIFIED CORRECT BY \_\_\_\_\_  
P. SPENCER, TOWN CLERK/RECORDER